

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

7 ANTWOINE DE'SEAN PARMER,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF
11 CORRECTIONS, JOHN and JANE DOE,
DR. NAVARRO, and DR. CUAYCONG,

12 Defendants.

No. C11-5390 RBL/KLS

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
COMPEL**

13
14 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Compel. ECF No. 32. The Court finds that the
15 motion should be denied because Plaintiff did not include a certification in his motion that he
16 conferred with counsel for Defendants before he filed his motion.

17 While a party may apply to the court for an order compelling discovery "upon reasonable
18 notice to other parties and all persons affected thereby," the motion must also include a
19 certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or
20 party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure the information or material without
21 court intervention." Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). In addition, "[a] good faith effort to confer with
22 a party or person not making a disclosure or discovery requires a face-to-face meeting or a
23 telephonic conference." Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(A).

24
25 The Court anticipates that the parties will confer and make a good faith effort to resolve
26 this discovery dispute without Court interference. If the parties cannot amicably resolve this

1 issue, Plaintiff may file a motion to compel, and shall include a certification stating that their
2 efforts were unsuccessful, and shall identify those areas of disagreement that remain unresolved.

3 The Court will not address any motion which lacks such a certification.

4 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

5 (1) Plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 32) is **DENIED**.

6 (2) The Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel
7 for Defendants.
8

9 **DATED** this 7th day of June, 2012.

10
11 

12 Karen L. Strombom
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26